IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

ROTHSCHILD PATENT IMAGING LLC,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	**Case No. 2:16-cv-01380-RWS**
v.	§	
	§	**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**
NETGEAR, INC.,	§	
Defendant.	§	

DEFENDANT NETGEAR, INC.'S ANSWER, DEFENSES, AND COUNTERCLAIMS
TO PLAINTIFF ROTHSCHILD PATENT IMAGING LLC'S COMPLAINT

Defendant NETGEAR, Inc. ("Defendant" or "NETGEAR") answers Plaintiff Rothschild Patent Imaging LLC's ("Plaintiff" or "Rothschild") Complaint for infringement of United States Patent numbers. 8,437,797 ("the '797 Patent"), 8,594,722 ("the '722 Patent"), and 8,204,437 ("the '437 Patent") (the "Complaint"), and asserts additional defenses and counterclaims against Rothschild as follows.

PARTIES AND JURISDICTION

1. NETGEAR admits that the Complaint purports to state a claim for patent infringement arising under Title 35 of the United States Code. NETGEAR denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint.

2. NETGEAR admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because this is a civil action for alleged patent infringement arising under the United States patent statutes.

3. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegation in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint. On that basis, NETGEAR denies the allegation.

4. NETGEAR admits the allegations in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

5. NETGEAR does not contest that this Court has personal jurisdiction over NETGEAR or that NETGEAR has conducted business and/or has engaged in activities in the state of Texas. NETGEAR denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

6. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint.

VENUE

7. NETGEAR alleges that venue is more convenient in the Northern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1404, and accordingly, NETGEAR will file a motion to transfer venue under § 1404(a) to that effect. NETGEAR denies any allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint that are inconsistent with the foregoing.

COUNT I: ALLEGED PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF THE '797 PATENT

8. NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-7 as if fully set forth herein.

9. NETGEAR admits that the Complaint purports to assert an action arising under the patent laws of the United States and, in particular, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, et seq.

10. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

11. NETGEAR admits that Exhibit A to the Complaint purports to be a copy of the '797 Patent, titled "Wireless Image Distribution System and Method."

12. NETGEAR admits that the '797 Patent was purportedly issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

13. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint.

14. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

15. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint.

16. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 16 of the Complaint.

17. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 17 of the Complaint.

18. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 18 of the Complaint.

19. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint.

20. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 20 of the Complaint.

21. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 21 of the Complaint.

22. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 22 of the Complaint.

23. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 23 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

COUNT II: ALLEGED PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF THE '722 PATENT

24. NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-23 as if fully set forth herein.

25. NETGEAR admits that the Complaint purports to assert an action arising under the patent laws of the United States and, in particular, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, *et seq.*

26. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 26 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

27. NETGEAR admits that Exhibit B to the Complaint purports to be a copy of the '722 Patent, titled "Wireless Image Distribution System and Method."

28. NETGEAR admits that the '722 Patent was purportedly issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 28 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

29. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 29 of the Complaint.

30. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 30 of the Complaint.

31. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 31 of the Complaint.

32. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 32 of the Complaint.

33. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 33 of the Complaint.

34. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 34 of the Complaint.

35. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 35 of the Complaint.

36. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 36 of the Complaint.

37. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 37 of the Complaint.

38. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 38 of the Complaint.

39. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 39 of the Complaint.

40. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 40 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

COUNT III: ALLEGED PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF THE '437 PATENT

41. NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-40 as if fully set forth herein.

42. NETGEAR admits that the Complaint purports to assert an action arising under the patent laws of the United States and, in particular, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, et seq.

43. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 43 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

44. NETGEAR admits that Exhibit C to the Complaint purports to be a copy of the '437 Patent, titled "Wireless Image Distribution System and Method."

45. NETGEAR admits that the '437 Patent was purportedly issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 45 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

46. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 46 of the Complaint.

47. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 47 of the Complaint.

48. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 48 of the Complaint.

49. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 49 of the Complaint.

50. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 50 of the Complaint.

51. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 51 of the Complaint.

52. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 52 of the Complaint.

53. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint.

54. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 54 of the Complaint.

55. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 55 of the Complaint.

56. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 56 of the Complaint.

57. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 57 of the Complaint.

58. NETGEAR denies the allegations in Paragraph 58 of the Complaint.

59. NETGEAR is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 59 of the Complaint, and on that basis denies them.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

NETGEAR demands a trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

NETGEAR denies that Rothschild is entitled to any of the relief sought in its Prayer for Relief or in the Complaint. Rothschild's prayer therefore should be denied in its entirety and its claims dismissed with prejudice.

FURTHER DENIAL

To the extent not expressly admitted above, the factual allegations contained in the Complaint are denied.

NETGEAR'S SEPARATE DEFENSES

60. NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-59 as if fully set forth herein. NETGEAR alleges and asserts the following defenses in response to Rothschild's allegations, undertaking the burden of proof only as to those defenses deemed affirmative defenses by law, irrespective of how such defenses are denominated herein. In addition, NETGEAR specifically reserves all rights to allege additional defenses that become known through the course of discovery.

FIRST SEPARATE DEFENSE
(Non-Infringement)

61. NETGEAR does not infringe and did not infringe, does not contribute and did not contribute to the infringement of, or does not induce and did not induce others to infringe any valid and enforceable claim of the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent, either directly, indirectly, literally, or under the doctrine of equivalents, willfully or otherwise.

SECOND SEPARATE DEFENSE
(Invalidity)

62. The claims of the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent are invalid for failure to comply with one or more requirements of United States Code, Title 35, including, but not limited to, 35 U.S.C. § 101, § 102, § 103, and/or one or more paragraphs of § 112.

THIRD SEPARATE DEFENSE
(Failure to State a Claim)

63. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

FOURTH SEPARATE DEFENSE
(Limitation on Damages)

64. Rothschild's claims for relief are barred at least in part by 35 U.S.C. § 286.

65. To the extent that Rothschild, its predecessors, or any licensee of the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent failed to properly mark any of their relevant products as required by 35 U.S.C. § 287 or otherwise give proper notice that NETGEAR's actions allegedly infringed any claim of the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent, NETGEAR is not liable to Rothschild for any alleged acts of infringement performed prior to filing of the Complaint.

FIFTH SEPARATE DEFENSE
(No Injunction Relief)

66. ROTHSCHILD is not entitled to any injunctive relief because any alleged injury to Rothschild is neither immediate nor irreparable, and Rothschild has adequate remedies at law.

SIXTH SEPARATE DEFENSE
(Laches, Waiver, Estoppel, Equitable Defenses)

67. Rothschild's claims for relief are barred, in whole or in part, by one or more equitable doctrines of laches, waiver, estoppel (including but not limited to equitable estoppel, prosecution history estoppel, and implied license by estoppel), unclean hands, and/or other equitable doctrines, including because Rothschild declined to timely enforce the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent. Rothschild or its predecessor knew or should have known of NETGEAR's allegedly infringing activities prior to filing the Complaint. Further, Rothschild never provided any notice that the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent were allegedly infringed.

SEVENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE
(Exhaustion/Express or Implied License)

68. Rothschild's claims against NETGEAR are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of exhaustion and/or to the extent that any of NETGEAR's products/services accused of infringement are directly or indirectly provided by NETGEAR to an entity having an express or implied license under the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent or incorporate equipment

directly or indirectly provided by an entity having an express or implied license under the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent.

EIGHTH SEPARATE DEFENSE
(Prosecution History Estoppel)

69. ROTHSCHILD is estopped from construing any valid claim of the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent to be infringed literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents due to claim amendments, admissions, and/or statements made before the United States Patent and Trademark Office during prosecution of the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent and/or any related patent applications and patents issuing therefrom.

NINTH SEPARATE DEFENSE
(No Cost)

70. Rothschild is barred by 35 U.S.C. § 288 from receiving any costs associated with this suit.

TENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE
(No Attorney Fees or Cost)

71. Rothschild is not entitled to any attorney's fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

ELEVENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE
(No Willful Infringement)

72. NETGEAR has not willfully infringed the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and/or '437 Patent.

TWELFTH SEPARATE DEFENSE
(Other Defenses)

73. NETGEAR reserves the right to supplement its defenses and/or add defenses as discovery proceeds in this action.

COUNTERCLAIMS

NETGEAR brings the following Counterclaims against Rothschild pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 13 and alleges as follows:

PARTIES AND JURISDICTION

74. NETGEAR is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 350 East Plumeria Drive, San Jose, California 95134.

75. Upon information and belief based solely on Paragraph 3 of the Complaint, Rothschild is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas. Rothschild maintains its principal place of business at 1400 Preston Rd., Suite 400, Plano, TX 75093. Rothschild has appeared for all purposes in this action.

76. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over these counterclaims under 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a), the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 100, *et seq.*, and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and this action is based upon an actual controversy between Rothschild and NETGEAR regarding the invalidity and non-infringement of the claims of the '797 Patent, '722 Patent, and '437 Patent.

77. Rothschild has previously appeared in this action, is represented by counsel, and has submitted to the personal jurisdiction of this Court.

VENUE

78. Rothschild consented to venue in this District by filing its Complaint against NETGEAR. NETGEAR alleges that venue is more convenient in the Northern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1404, and accordingly, NETGEAR will file a motion to transfer under § 1404(a) to that effect.

COUNT I: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '797 PATENT

79. To the extent not inconsistent, NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-78 as if fully set forth herein.

80. In its Complaint, Rothschild alleges that it is "the owner by assignment" of the '797 Patent, and that NETGEAR infringed and infringes one or more claims of the '797 Patent. Absent a declaration of non-infringement, Rothschild will continue to wrongfully assert the '797 Patent against NETGEAR, thereby causing NETGEAR irreparable injury. Therefore, an actual justiciable controversy exists between NETGEAR and Rothschild concerning the alleged infringement of the '797 Patent.

81. NETGEAR does not and has not directly (whether individually or jointly) or indirectly (whether contributorily or by inducement) infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claim of the '797 Patent.

82. The NETGEAR Arlo Q and Arlo Q Plus (collectively "the Accused Products") do not infringe independent Claim 6 of the '797 Patent, or claims depending therefrom, because they do not include every required claim feature. By way of example, the Accused Products do not include a processor "configured to initiate and/or perform . . . filtering the plurality of photographic images using a transfer criteria . . . and receiving, via the wireless receiver and from the second mobile device, the transfer criteria," as required by the claims.

83. NETGEAR is not willfully, deliberately, or intentionally infringing and has not willfully, deliberately, or intentionally infringed any claim of the '797 Patent.

84. NETGEAR seeks a declaration to that effect pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*

COUNT II: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE '797 PATENT

85. To the extent not inconsistent, NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-84 as if fully set forth herein.

86. In its Complaint, Rothschild alleges that it is "the owner by assignment" of the '797 Patent and that NETGEAR infringed and infringes one or more claims of the '797 Patent. Absent a declaration of invalidity, Rothschild will continue to wrongfully assert the '797 Patent against NETGEAR, thereby causing NETGEAR irreparable injury. Therefore, an actual justiciable controversy exists between NETGEAR and Rothschild concerning the alleged infringement of the '797 Patent.

87. The claims of the '797 Patent are invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the requirements of the patent laws, including, but not limited to, 35 U.S.C. § 101, § 102, § 103, and/or one or more paragraphs of § 112 and the rules and laws pertaining to those provisions.

88. For example, the claims of '797 Patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or § 103 in view of at least one or more of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/004916 ("the '916 Publication"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0133526 ("the '526 Publication"), and/or U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0174206 ("the '206 Publication").

89. NETGEAR seeks a declaration to that effect pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*

COUNT III: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '722 PATENT

90. To the extent not inconsistent, NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-89 as if fully set forth herein.

91. In its Complaint, Rothschild alleges that it is "the owner by assignment" of the '722 Patent, and that NETGEAR infringed and infringes one or more claims of the '722 Patent. Absent a declaration of non-infringement, Rothschild will continue to wrongfully assert the '722 Patent against NETGEAR, thereby causing NETGEAR irreparable injury. Therefore, an actual justiciable controversy exists between NETGEAR and Rothschild concerning the alleged infringement of the '722 Patent.

92. NETGEAR does not and has not directly (whether individually or jointly) or indirectly (whether contributorily or by inducement) infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claim of the '722 Patent.

93. The Accused Products do not infringe independent claim 1 of the '722 Patent, or claims depending therefrom, because they do not include every required claim feature. By way of example, the Accused Products do not include a processor

> configured to initiate and/or perform . . . filtering the plurality of photographic images using a transfer criteria; and transmitting, . . . the filtered plurality of photographic images, wherein the image-capturing mobile device and the second mobile capturing device are disposed in a selectively paired relationship with one another based upon the subject identification,

as required by the claims.

94. The Accused Products do not infringe independent claim 5 of the '722 Patent, or claims depending therefrom, because they do not include every required claim feature. By way of example, the Accused Products do not include

> filtering the plurality of photographic images using a transfer criteria; and transmitting, . . . the filtered plurality of photographic images, wherein the image-capturing mobile device and the second mobile are disposed in a selectively paired relationship with one another based upon a geographic location of at least one of the plurality of photographic images,

as required by the claims.

95. NETGEAR is not willfully, deliberately, or intentionally infringing and has not willfully, deliberately, or intentionally infringed any claim of the '722 Patent.

96. NETGEAR seeks a declaration to that effect pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*

COUNT IV:
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE '722 PATENT

97. To the extent not inconsistent, NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-96 as if fully set forth herein.

98. In its Complaint, Rothschild alleges that it is "the owner by assignment" of the '722 Patent and that NETGEAR infringed and infringes one or more claims of the '722 Patent. Absent a declaration of invalidity, Rothschild will continue to wrongfully assert the '722 Patent against NETGEAR, thereby causing NETGEAR irreparable injury. Therefore, an actual justiciable controversy exists between NETGEAR and Rothschild concerning the alleged infringement of the '722 Patent.

99. The claims of the '722 Patent is invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the requirements of the patent laws, including, but not limited to, 35 U.S.C. § 101, § 102, § 103, and/or one or more paragraphs of § 112 and the rules and laws pertaining to those provisions.

100. For example, the claims of the '722 Patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or § 103 in view of at least one or more of the '916 Publication, the '526 Publication, and/or the '206 Publication.

101. NETGEAR seeks a declaration to that effect pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*

COUNT V: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '437 PATENT

102. To the extent not inconsistent, NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-101 as if fully set forth herein.

103. In its Complaint, Rothschild alleges that it is "the owner by assignment" of the '437 Patent, and that NETGEAR infringed and infringes one or more claims of the '437 Patent. Absent a declaration of non-infringement, Rothschild will continue to wrongfully assert the '437 Patent against NETGEAR, thereby causing NETGEAR irreparable injury. Therefore, an actual justiciable controversy exists between NETGEAR and Rothschild concerning the alleged infringement of the '437 Patent.

104. NETGEAR does not and has not directly (whether individually or jointly) or indirectly (whether contributorily or by inducement) infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claim of the '437 Patent.

105. The Accused Products do not infringe independent claim 1 of the '437 Patent, or claims depending therefrom, because they do not include every required claim feature. By way of example, the Accused Products do not include

> said first network component is structured to communicate the at least one digital photographic image to said receiving device via said at least one wireless network, and said receiving device comprising a second network component, wherein said second network component is structured to receive the at least one digital photographic image from said capturing device via said at least one wireless network, wherein said capturing device and said receiving device are disposed in a selectively paired relationship with one another, said selectively paired relationship is at least partially based on said capturing device and said receiving device being cooperatively associated with at least one common pre-defined pairing criteria, and said pre-defined pairing criteria comprises a geographic location of said capturing device,

as required by the claims.

106. NETGEAR is not willfully, deliberately, or intentionally infringing and has not willfully, deliberately, or intentionally infringed any claim of the '437 Patent.

107. NETGEAR seeks a declaration to that effect pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*

COUNT VI:
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE '437 PATENT

108. To the extent not inconsistent, NETGEAR re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing Paragraphs 1-107 as if fully set forth herein.

109. In its Complaint, Rothschild alleges that it is "the owner by assignment" of the '437 Patent and that NETGEAR infringed and infringes one or more claims of the '437 Patent. Absent a declaration of invalidity, Rothschild will continue to wrongfully assert the '437 Patent against NETGEAR, thereby causing NETGEAR irreparable injury. Therefore, an actual justiciable controversy exists between NETGEAR and Rothschild concerning the alleged infringement of the '437 Patent.

110. The claims of the '437 Patent is invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the requirements of the patent laws, including, but not limited to, 35 U.S.C. § 101, § 102, § 103, and/or one or more paragraphs of § 112 and the rules and laws pertaining to those provisions.

111. For example, the claims of the '437 Patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or § 103 in view of at least one or more of the '916 Publication, the '526 Publication, and/or the '206 Publication.

112. NETGEAR seeks a declaration to that effect pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*

NETGEAR'S PRAYER FOR RELIEF

NETGEAR, reserving its right to amend its pleadings to add additional defenses, affirmative defenses, and counterclaims if warranted by discovery, prays for the following relief:

a) A judgment that NETGEAR has not infringed any claim of the '797 Patent;

b) A judgment that the claims of the '797 Patent are invalid;

c) A judgment that NETGEAR has not infringed any claim of the '722 Patent;

d) A judgment that the claims of the '722 Patent are invalid;

e) A judgment that NETGEAR has not infringed any claim of the '437 Patent;

f) A judgment that the claims of the '437 Patent are invalid;

g) A judgment that Rothschild's Complaint be dismissed with prejudice, and that Rothschild takes nothing by its Complaint; and

h) An award to NETGEAR of its costs and attorney's fees incurred in this action and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

NETGEAR demands trial by jury on all issues.

Date: February 13, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

By *\/s/Robert Greeson*

Robert Greeson (Texas Bar No. 24045979)
robert.greeson@nortonrosefulbright.com

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 3600
Dallas, Texas 75201-7932
Tel: (214) 855-7430
Fax: (214) 855-8200

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT NETGEAR, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on February 13, 2017, all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system. Any other counsel of record will be served in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

/s/Robert Greeson
Robert Greeson